



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

wearers," for Europeans. Kindred and friendly tribes were often designated by their geographical position : the *Nipissirini-wek*, (Nipissings) and other tribes between the Ottawa and the lakes were, to the Montagnez, *A<sup>n</sup>goumek* "on the other side," the Indians of Maine were "of the east land" (*Abnaki*), to western Algonkins.

7. For Woman, some modification of the root of Chip. *ikwé*, Mass. *esqua*, 'femina,' is found in every Algonkin language, as an inseparable generic if not as an independent name. It is the common appellation of both *mulier* and *uxor*, and its diminutive, of *puella* : but there are distinct names for *mulier* and *uxor* in every language, as there are also for *juvencula* and *virgo*, though Eliot does not appear to have discovered in the Massachusetts dialect either of the last two, and one has often been mistaken for the other in the compilation of vocabularies and by translators.

---

# VIII.—On Some Forms of Conditional Sentences in Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit.

By JAMES B. GREENOUGH,  
TUTOR IN LATIN IN HARVARD COLLEGE.

IN the treatment of the Protasis and Apodosis or Hypothetical Period the so-called General Supposition, since it was first distinguished by Professor Goodwin, has, among American scholars at least, been generally recognized in Greek, but in Latin it has not commonly been admitted to exist except as a Grecism.

It is useful for a logical treatment of the subject in Latin, as well as for the purposes of comparative syntax — a branch of the science of language that has not as yet been much attended to — to determine whether this form of protasis and apodosis is an heirloom of the Indo-European family, or only a special development in the Greek, which was afterwards borrowed by the Latin.

Now the nature of this form is this : the protasis or con-

dition does not refer to a single act or event, in present or past time, upon which the conclusion is founded. This form it is the province of the indicative in both clauses to express. Nor does the protasis refer to a future act or event upon the happening of which the apodosis will be true. This form is expressed either by the optative in both clauses, or by the subjunctive in the first with the future indicative in the second. But what the protasis does refer to, is the indefinite or repeated happening of an act or event in all time (or at any past time), upon every occurrence of which the apodosis becomes (or became) true. The formula for this kind of hypothetical sentence is: "If ever he does (or did) this, it is (or was) in all such cases well," — and this idea is clearly distinguishable from "If he is now doing this, it is well," as well as from "If he should do (or does) this, it would (or will) be well." And in Greek this distinction is carefully maintained. † The first is 'Εάν τοῦτο πράττη καλῶς ἔχει. The second is 'Εἰ τοῦτο πράττει καλῶς ἔχει. The third is 'Εάν τοῦτο πράττη καλῶς ἔξει. To use Prof. Goodwin's examples:

"Ἦν ποτε δασμὸς ἴκηται σοὶ τὸ γέρας πολὺ μείζον, *Il.* i. 66. If ever (that is, in all cases in which) a division comes, your prize is always greater.

"Εἰ τις ἀντίποι εὐθὺς τεθνήκει. *Thuc.* viii. 66. If any one refused (in all cases of refusal) he was put to death.

So also with all indefinite relatives and relative particles :

'Ηνίκ' ἂν δ' οἴκοι γέγωνται, ἐρῶσιν οὐκ ἀνασχετά. *Arist. Pax.* 1179 ;  
 "Ὅτε ἔξω τοῦ δεινοῦ γένοιτο πολλοὶ αὐτὸν ἀπέλειπον. *Xen. Anab.* ii. 6. 12. The protasis is expressed by the subjunctive or optative, according to the time of the condition, but the apodosis is some form of the indicative expressing a general truth either in the present or past. Occasionally however the protasis also is expressed by the indicative, like the particular condition present or past, a fact which is significant as throwing light on the Latin usage. Now in Latin, at least in the monuments of literature, this form of construction is not ordinarily distinguished from the particular condition in present or past time, so that the exceptional Greek is the usual Latin form. There are however some traces of this construction in Latin

which agree with the Greek though from their rarity they have usually been considered as imitations.

It has long been noticed that the second person singular of an indefinite subject has a kind of affinity, so to speak, for the subjunctive mood. It is obvious that there is no magic about this second person which should change the mood of the verb when with any other person it would be indicative; the difference must be in the nature of the thought expressed. Upon examination these cases are found to be of two kinds. They are always either protases or apodoses. The protases of this kind correspond for the most part to two forms of apodoses. Their apodoses are either in the subjunctive or some other form referring to the future, or in the present indicative used to express a general truth. In the first case they are clearly cases of future protasis and apodosis of the ordinary form: e. g. *In qua (amicitia) nisi, ut dicitur, apertum pectus videas, tuumque ostendas, nihil fidum, nihil exploratum habeas.* Cic. *Laelius*, xxvii. 97. So also, *Ubi enim istum invenias qui honorem amici anteponat suo?* Ibid. xvii. 64,—where the protasis is omitted, an exceedingly common usage. So, *Quod si etiam possis quidvis deferre ad alterum, videndum est tamen quid ille possit sustinere.* Ibid. xx. 73,—where the participle in *dus* takes the place of a future form. Now in the second case this construction has never to my knowledge been analyzed, but it seems to me unmistakably the same as the Greek general supposition. Take for instance; *Vita humana prope uti ferrum est, si exerceas conteritur.* Cato. *Carmen de Moribus*, cited by Aulus Gellius, xi. 2 (Jordan, *Reliquiae Catonis*, p. 83). Here we have the subjunctive in protasis referring to any one of a series of acts, with the indicative in the apodosis expressing a general truth, precisely parallel with *ἐὰν τοῦτο πράττῃς καλῶς ἔχει*, which is the regular construction. So, *Virtutem necessario gloria etiamsi tu id non agas, consequitur.* Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* i. 38. So also with relatives and relative particles: *Bonus segnior fit ubi negligas,* Sall. *Jug.* 31; *Cum animum ab istis imaginibus ad veritatem traduxeris nihil relinquitur,* Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* 55.

One can hardly realize the frequency of this construction

unless his attention is particularly called to it. In fact it is almost universal in writers of all periods. In order therefore that the frequency as well as the nature of the construction may be understood, examples are given at some length:

*Istaec ubi periculum facias aculeata sunt*, Those things when you try them are full of stings. Pl. *Bacch.* v. 63; *At nunc si attingas eum manu, paedagogo puer tabula dirumpit caput*, But now if you lay your hand on him the boy breaks his master's head with a slate. Ibid. v. 440; *Quom patrem adeas postulatum puero sic dicit pater*. Ibid.; *Quos quom censeas esse amicos reperiuntur falsi falsimoniis*. Ibid. v. 540; *In re mala animo si bono utare adjuvat*. *Capt.* v. 202; *Nam doli non doli sunt, nisi astu colas; set malum maximum, si id palam provenit* (observe the third person in the indicative, in precisely the same construction). Ibid. v. 221; *Consimilest quom stertas, quasi sorbeas*, *Mil. Gl.* v. 820; *De magnis divitiis, siquid demas plus fit an minus?* *Trin.* v. 348; *Mage si exigere occupias duarum rerum exoritur optio*. Ibid. v. 1052; *Stultus et sine gratia's. Tibi recte facere? quando quod facias perit*. You're a fool and thankless fellow. Do rightly by you, when what one does is lost upon you! *Aul.* v. 335.

*Uxor, si cesses, aut te amare cogital, aut etc.* (see whole passage). Ter. *Ad.* v. 32; *Ille quem beneficio adjungas, ex animo facit*. Ibid. v. 72; *At tamen 'ubi fides' si roges, nil pudent*. *And.* v. 637.

*Tantum remanet, quod virtute et recte factis consecutus sis*. Cic. *Cat. Maj.* xix. 69; *Quae (exercitationes virtutum) cum diu multumque vixeris mirificos efferunt fructus*. Ibid. iii. 9; *At memoria minuitur, credo, (parenthetical) nisi eam exerceas aut si sis natura tardior*. Ibid. vii. 21; *Quae (utilitas) tamen ipsa efflorescit ex amicitia etiamsi tu minus secutus sis*. *Lael.* xxvii. 100. *Sed haec adjuvant in oratore . . si quid persequare acrius, ut invitus et coactus facere videare*. *De Orat.* ii. 43; *Hic quantum fit mali, si non levem testem laeseris?* Ibid. ii. 74; *Ista discuntur facile si et tantum sumas quantum opus sit*, etc. Ibid. iii. 23; *Plures ineuntur gratiae si uno tempore dicas pro pluribus*. *Brut.* 57, ad fin.; [*Conformatio*] *sententiarum permanet, quibuscunque verbis uti velis*. *de Orat.* iii. 52.

*Nam si velis quod nondum vetitum est, timeas ne vetere; at si prohibita impune transcenderis, neque metus ultra neque pudor est* (where in the first sentence we have the second person in both protasis and apodosis, and hence the subjunctive; in the second the apodosis has the third person, and hence the indicative). Tac. *Ann.* iii. 54.

*Plerique, quae delicta reprehenderis malevolentia et invidia putant.* Sal. *Cat.* 3.

That this construction is not imitated from the Greek is sufficiently proved, it seems to me, by its universality at all periods of the language, and secondly, by the fact that in the same sentence the second person is expressed by the subjunctive but the third by the indicative, a distinction which is entirely foreign to the Greek. Obviously if the earliest writers were copying from the Greek they would have used the subjunctive throughout, as the Greek does. Several of the examples from Plautus are of this kind: e. g. *In mala uxore atque inimico siquid sumas, sumptus est; in bono hospiti atque amico quaestus est quod sumitur.* Plaut. *Miles Glo.*, v. 673; *Volup est quod agas, si id procedit lepide.* Ibid. v. 947; *Nimia'st voluptas, si diu afueris domo domum ubi redieris, si tibi nulla aegritudo animo obviam'st.* Stich., v. 524. See also Tac. *Ann.* iii. 54, and Plaut. *Capt.*, v. 221, cited above.

There are a few cases where the same construction is used in the first and third persons: e. g.

*Nihil proficiunt mercatores nisi admodum mentiantur.* Cic. *de Off.* i. 42; *Luxuria vero cum omni aetate turpis, tum senectuti foedissima est. Sin autem libidinum etiam intemperantia accesserit, duplex malum est.* Cic. *de Off.* 1. 34; *Neque alitur si faciat ullam inter suos habet auctoritatem.* Caes. *B. G.* vi. 11; — see also, Caes. *B. C.* ii. 24, Q. Curt. vi. 5.

It will be observed that all the cases thus far have been in present or general time, corresponding to the Greek subjunctive and expressed with the present tense in the apodosis.

But it has long been noticed that the same construction was used exceptionally, especially by later writers — not to my knowledge by Cicero,—of past time, with the imperfect in apodosis, corresponding to the Greek optative with the im-

perfect. It is this construction which has been considered a Grecism. *Si quis a domino prehenderetur consensu militum eripiebatur.* Caes. *B. C.* iii. 110.

The cases are numerous but as the construction is familiar the passages are only referred to :—

Caes. *B. C.* ii. 41 ; Liv. ii. 27, iii. 11, xxxiv. 38, iii. 19, i. 32, viii. 8 ; Q. Curt. iv. 30, ad fin. ; Nepos, xvii. 8, xx. 4, xxv. 2, xvii. 1, xviii. 3 ; Sallust. *Jug.* 58 ; Tac. *Ann.* vi. 30.

This same construction also occurs in Sanskrit, that is, with the protasis in the subjunctive or optative and the apodosis in the indicative, expressing a general truth. The more common construction however is with the subjunctive or optative in both, as in the first case of the second person in Latin, mentioned above.

For Sanskrit scholars I may cite Rig-Veda, i. 94. 15 ; i. 79. 2 ; i. 79. 3 ; Hitopadesa, 800.

Now we see this construction regularly used in Greek, very frequently found in Sanskrit, and in Latin universal in one form and occurring occasionally in other forms in writers of various dates. We are naturally led to conclude that this construction was in use more or less in Indo-European times and was received by each of the languages as a part of the original inheritance. It was afterwards developed by the Greek almost to the exclusion of other forms, so that the indicative is only the exception, but gradually disused by the Latin except in one or two cases, to re-appear again occasionally in the later language, while the Sanskrit retained both constructions.

It is worth while perhaps to consider the origin of the construction. This is not difficult to see if we consider the origin of the use of the subjunctive and optative in protasis generally. There can be no doubt that the original form of the hypothetical sentence (so far as the condition is future or general or contrary to fact) is represented by such expressions as "*Tolle hanc opinionum, luctum sustuleris*" and "*Naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret,*" in which two coördinate clauses appear, the first containing a command, and the sec-

ond a consequence of the (implied) performance of that command. Now it is obvious that such a formula may develop into two constructions, the one meaning "Let one do so and so, (and) such will be the effect;" the other stating the consequence more generally, as "Let one do so and so, (and) such is (always) the effect." These two correspond to the particular and general protases. In Greek both forms are used in their proper place. In Latin the former is chosen for future protasis and many general protases, as it obviously makes little difference whether one says "such is the effect" or such "will be the effect," when the statement is intended to be general.

In the case of the second person singular of an indefinite subject the language adopts both, but for the ordinary general condition it takes another form, of different origin, in which the protasis is not a command at all but a statement of a fact which for the moment is assumed to be true. This form gives the indicative in both clauses, a construction which as we have seen occurs also exceptionally in Greek. The Sanskrit adopts most commonly the first form both for future and general conditions, but it also often uses the second with the indicative in the apodosis, like the Greek.

In regard to the origin of the protasis generally, see the able treatise "*Der Gebrauch des Conjunctivs und Optativs im Sanskrit und Griechischen*," by B. Delbrück (Halle, 1871).